

REMARKS

In paragraph 4 of the office action, Section 112 objections were posed. Claim 9 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for "said motion detection information" used in line 6. With respect to the objection to imaging device, there already is antecedent basis for that term in line 2 of the claim.

Therefore, all of the other Section 112 objections are believed to have been overcome.

Claim 1 was rejected under Section 102 based on the Ramirez Diaz patent. However, Ramirez Diaz does not teach forming packets containing both imaging data and motion detection information. Instead, Ramirez Diaz simply uses motion detection to trigger compression. But nothing in any of the material cited in the office action indicates that the compressed information, assuming it was placed in packets, includes motion detection information.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2004



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]